UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Louis L. Mann, Curtis W. Reese, *Associate Editors*

Are We Sane?

By JESSE H. HOLMES

Thoughts of Tolstoy

PART XIV

Some Facts and Figures About India

By I. VIJAYA-TUNGA

An Englishman on India

By WILFRED WELLOCK

VOLUME CVI NUMBER 23

Chicago, February 16, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA NAGELEY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
DAVID STARR JORDAN
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
WALTER WALSH
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
ITALY—DOROTHY WALTON
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 355
Are We Sane?—JESSE H. HOLMES 357
Jottings—J. H. H. 358

ARTICLES—
The Common Right of Humanity—*Abraham Lincoln* 355
Young Men and War—*Laurence Housman* 359
Thoughts of Tolstoy—Part XIV 361
Some Facts and Figures About India—I. VIJAYA-TUNGA 363

POETRY—
The Steadfast Ways of Peace—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 364

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Founding Fathers—JAMES H. FAIRLEY 365

CORRESPONDENCE—
An Englishman on India—WILFRED WELLOCK 366
Mr. Chaffee Answers His Critics—EDMUND B. CHAFFEE 367
Mooney and Billings—FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL and HUBERT C. HERRING 367
Starvation in Porto Rico—THEODORE ROOSEVELT 367
"Woeful Lack of Leaders"—WILL LEVINGTON COMFORT 367

THE FIELD—
A Suggestion for a Presidential Proclamation—*Anonymous* 354
The Five Year Plan—NORMAN THOMAS 368
Hooked Rugs for Relief 368

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Suggestion for a Presidential Proclamation

I feel called on to address my fellow citizens on the subject of prohibition, for I believe it has now assumed an aspect, so sinister, as to call for united effort. It is no longer a question as to the desirability of prohibition but whether a small and vicious group can flaunt the authority of the Government; can corrupt public officials and those charged with the enforcement of law and can bring the country into disrepute throughout the world. The crushing of such malefactors becomes a patriotic duty for all who value our country's honor.

I urge our people to unite as one man in this matter and venture to suggest the various ways in which every group can be of service.

First—the legal profession. Lawyers are the sworn servants of the Courts and above all, are responsible for the observance of law. I call on the Bar Associations throughout the country to unite in a campaign to secure judges having jurisdiction over misdemeanors, and prosecuting attorneys, who shall be beyond suspicion. I need not refer to the many cases in which such officers have been corrupt, or have been suspected of corruption.

I call on Congress to enact a law, making fines of convicted violators of the prohibition law without limit. It is ridiculous to assess fines less than the entire amount illegally gained. If it can be legally done, these fines should follow the illegal funds in other hands, so that the criminal may not transfer his gains to other parties, as a gift.

I ask Congress further to tax to extinction the manufacture and sale of the various malt extracts, which are used to enable people to violate the law.

I call upon the various chain store groups and all other persons who handle such malt extracts, to refrain from selling them. They should not profit by an illegal business.

I call upon the banks to refuse to handle the accounts of the manufacturers of such malt extracts or the accounts of any persons whom they suspect to be engaged in illegal traffic in liquors.

I urge municipal administrators and especially chiefs of police, to carefully comb the police forces and remove those who are in conspiracy with liquor sellers.

I beg to have the earnest cooperation of the great body of automobile manufacturers and makers of automobile accessories. We cannot go on indefinitely killing over 25,000 people a year and maiming over 500,000, some of whom eventually die. A considerable proportion of these accidents is due to the intoxication of automobile drivers, who either injure themselves or innocent persons. All decent automobile drivers have a direct interest in the observance of the law.

I ask the Life Insurance Companies to insert in their policies a provision

(*Continued on Page* 368)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVI MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1931 NUMBER 23

THE COMMON RIGHT OF HUMANITY!

It is the eternal struggle between these two principles —right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity, the other the divine right of kings. It is the same spirit in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the spirit that says, "You toil and work and earn bread, and I'll eat it." No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his nation and live by the fruit of their labor or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle.

—Abraham Lincoln

Winston Churchill is no constructive statesman, but he is a devastating critic. His speech at Manchester, denouncing the Indian policy of the MacDonald government, illustrated perfectly this destructive power of England's most brilliant and erratic political genius. When he said, for example, that the imprisonment of Gandhi had made the Mahatma a "martyr and national hero," and that in his release he had "emerged as a triumphant victor," he summed up with flawless precision the exact truth about MacDonald's bungling policy toward the India leader. To this Churchill might well have added Gandhi's own statement that "the mere release of the members of the Congress working committee will be of little help. Even for creating an atmosphere suitable for calm discussion, the release of all the Congress party prisoners, the withdrawal of the repressive ordinances, and the restoration of confiscated property are absolutely essential." But Churchill's analysis of the real character of the so-called Indian settlement was the most devastating part of his speech. The draft of the federal constitution, he said, had been "loosely put together," and had settled "not one of the thorny problems of Indian life, or the real difficulty of machinery." He declared that "gaps and faults in the structure were covered up with clouds of perorations and pious platitudes;" and he emphasized not unjustly that "what is given in word is taken back in fact; what is given with one hand is taken back with the other." This settlement may satisfy the English, for the English are acting under pressure and are glad to get away with anything that may hold India inside the Empire. But that it will satisfy the Indians is exceedingly dubious. Listen to the pronouncement of the official newspaper organ of the Nationalist party which describes MacDonald's proposals as "a bogus peace gesture," and declares to the people that they "must make sedition (their) national religion"!

Americans, we are told, are opposed to the "dole," but what is the proposed Congressional appropriation of three billion dollars and more for the benefit of the war veterans but a "dole" without the justification of a "dole"? What the Government is doing is handing out money to its citizens, only instead of doing this scientifically, upon the basis of an organized and carefully guarded system of distribution, as in England, this nation is proposing to hand out money as pure charity. What is worse, this charity is bestowed upon a favored class of the community which, for sentimental and other reasons, is able to organize and direct political pressure upon Washington. If starving men are not veterans (so-called) who spent a few months of pleasant vacation in some one of the war cantonments of this country in 1917-1918, but simply workers who have spent years of honest toil in industry without winning any fair return for their labor, then they can continue to starve for all the Government cares. We would like to be in favor of this appropriation if only because Mr. Mellon is against it. We are not a bit bothered by huge appropriations in time of need—if we had our way, Congress would appropriate one billion dollars tomorrow morning for the immediate construction of public works—but we object, and object strenuously, to handing out money from the public treasury to a limited and favored class who happen to be able to get their grip on the treasure chest of the nation. So we hope this American "dole" will not pass. And if it does pass, we hope President Hoover will have the courage to veto and thus kill the bill.

It is now our turn to eat a great big dish of humble pie, while all the UNITY family look on. For after all our ridicule of the colleges for talking much and doing little about the football scandal, and all our solemn prophecy that the colleges would continue to talk much and do little, lo and behold, here is a college which has actually stopped talking and done something.

And it is one of our greatest universities, too! Well, to paraphrase Benedict in Shakespeare's "Much Ado About Nothing," when we said that this would not happen, we never dreamed that we would live to see it happen. What the University of Pennsylvania has done to curb the athletic evil is really enough to take one's breath away. The football coach, for example, is no longer going to be paid a salary to dazzle the eyes of a Wall Street magnate, but is going to be rated on the same basis of income as a member of the faculty. The coach, in other words, will get no more money for his work on the football field than the professor of Greek for his work in the classroom. It seems incredible, but it happens to be true. Then, the football players and other athletes are not to live any longer in special dormitories and eat at special training tables, but must take pot-luck with other ordinary mortals in the college. Expensive trips, week-end rest periods in the country, luxurious equipment, etc., all are to be done away. The athletes are even to be denied scholarship and other financial favors, and, although this point is not stressed, will probably be expected now to do a little studying. That we had a man in this country capable of working this vast reform, we had not imagined. But such a man apparently exists in Thomas S. Gates, President of the University of Pennsylvania. We beg to move that, after President Gates has accomplished his job in Philadelphia, he be taken to Washington and given a chance to take the federal government in hand.

It is impossible that any civilized person should rejoice at a lynching. If it were possible, we should rejoice at the recent lynching in North Dakota, where a mob of staid northern citizens took a white man from jail and hanged him from a bridge. We say this not because we have any sympathy for this gang of murderers, or lack of sympathy for the unhappy victim, or any toleration of lynching under any circumstances. Our emotion is prompted rather by the fact that this latest lynching was in one of our northernmost northern states, and had no remotest connection with a Negro and the so-called "usual crime." These features of this latest horror may possibly serve to give the nation a shock, and thus arouse the public conscience to some interest in and attention to the amazing recrudescence of lynching in recent months. There was a time when we thought we were overcoming this evil. Steadily the number of lynchings in the country was going down. In 1928 and 1929 the total per year had dropped to as low a figure as eleven and twelve. Then suddenly last year there came that wave of violence which raised the number of lynchings to more than double the number of the year before. This year was opened horribly by the burning alive of a Negro in Maryville, Missouri. Now for the first time in we know not how many years, the hand of lawless violence has reached to the far north and seized a white man! Northern soil, of course, is no more sacred than southern soil. There is no reason why, if lynching is going to continue as a popular out-door sport of the American people, the whites should not suffer equally with the blacks. But as a matter of fact, lynching has been predominantly a feature of inter-racial life, and has been defended by its shameless perpetrators and advocates as a punishment peculiarly adapted to the Negro. Now we are again reminded that this crime is a scourge which, once let loose, infects us all. If Negroes may be lynched with impunity, then white men must take their turn. If one man is slain by mob violence, which one of us all is safe? It is a disgrace that this appeal to the self-regarding instinct of human nature must be made in a case of this kind. But in the failure of religion and the public conscience to conquer the evil, we can only be glad that this prudential aspect of the matter is now at work.

Our readers must have long since learned that we have a weakness for "great men" lists. Some of our friends insist upon emphasizing the word "weakness," for they insist that great impersonal forces of political and economic life are far more important than personalities, even the greatest. We have no doubt that this is correct; yet do we shamelessly confess that our interest in great men still remains. Hence our attraction to the attempt of Rabbi Louis I. Newman, of New York, to name "the ten greatest living men"! His list includes Thomas A. Edison, Albert Einstein, Mahatma Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore, Joseph Stalin, Leon Trotsky, Benito Mussolini, Henri Bergson, Ernest Bloch, and Bernard Shaw. This is a good list. Seven of the ten names—Edison, Einstein, Gandhi, Tagore, Stalin, Trotsky, Shaw—we would endorse without a moment's hesitation. The other three we would at least ponder for a time. Why Bloch, for example? He is a "representative composer," as Rabbi Newman declares, but is there the genius in him that there is in Jan Sibellius, for example, or Richard Strauss? Surely, these two have stood the test of time and international acceptance as Bloch has not. Bergson was undoubtedly the greatest of contemporary philosophers until he burnt out during the war. Has not John Dewey since moved into his place? As for Mussolini, we dissent altogether, and as we must have a place for Roman Rolland in our list of ten, we nominate the great French pacifist as a substitute for the Italian jingo. And what about Sigmund Freud, a man named in Wells's new book as sure of immortality as Darwin? Names absent from Dr. Newman's list are conspicuous. Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Ramsay MacDonald, Raymond Poincaré—how are the mighty fallen!

Wise words were spoken the other day by Dr. Charles C. Selecman, President of the Southern Methodist University of Dallas, Texas:

> The modern church has produced a life condition where the pastor is so beset with societies, clubs, social engagements, addresses, funerals, weddings, hospital calls and committee meetings, plus telephone interruptions, that he lives in confusion.
>
> In many churches his office is a public highway for choir, or Sunday school workers, or board members, up to the point of public worship. This dulls the spiritual perception of infinite realities and takes from the message something of that note of calm and authority that a hungry throng craves and has a right to expect.

With an experience of nearly twenty-five years in a city church, we feel that Dr. Selecman has chanted in softest undertones the truth about one of the most disastrous aspects of church life today. If there is any man harder worked than the average minister, we do not happen to know who he is. The business man, who wanders into his office at ten o'clock, dictates a few letters, goes out to attend a meeting of the Three-Hours-for-Lunch Club, returns to his office for a conference or two, and ends his day on the golf links, seems to us to be playing kindergarten as compared with the clergyman. This clergyman, if he has an active church, has never a moment to himself. He labors twelve to fourteen hours a day, seven days in the week. He lives at everybody's beck and call, does a hundred things which have no more relation to his professional task than plumbing or carpentry, writes letters and reports, attends conferences and committee meetings, is present at club and social functions, gives addresses and casual talks, serves on library and hospital boards, marries the young, buries the old, calls on the sick and infirm, and at odd moments, when he is catching his breath, prepares a sermon for Sunday. Often he climbs into the pulpit aching with fatigue, dull-witted from lack of sleep, carrying a sermon half-prepared. And he is expected to preach in a way to outmatch old Chrysostom himself! The idea that a minister is a specialist, like a physician or a scholar, seems to have disappeared from the modern mind. Yet we wonder that the breed of great preachers is disappearing, and that the pulpit does not speak with the learning and spiritual authority of a half-century ago. If the church is to be saved, the minister must be guaranteed his hours of quiet, his days of meditation and repose, his release from countless chores. He should be undisturbed by the thousand-and-one entanglements of contemporary life, and left to brood with his own soul and therein find the deeps of the spirit. And, incidentally, why does not the church adopt the sabbatical practice of the college in releasing its minister one year in seven? No institution of learning would think of keeping a professor in his chair year after year without refreshment. Yet we know of many a clergyman who has labored and preached for a generation with never a chance to quench his eager thirst at the flowing fountains of knowledge and inspiration. If religion's voice grows dumb and its vision dull, it is the churches which are to blame for working their ministers like cart horses.

Are We Sane?

I suppose everyone now and then experiences a moment of abstraction in which he looks himself over in a kind of detached way and wonders who and what he really is, whether he is actually sane, and what it means to be sane, anyway. We have been hounded lately by some such experience not concerning our own personal self, but concerning the social and industrial civilization around us. The only available and intelligible test for sanity is a certain consistency and order in the conduct of affairs, such order tending to desired and desirable ends. And the desired and desirable ends are quite clearly stated in our fundamental state papers such as the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, famous addresses of Washington, Lincoln and other statesmen. There seems to be no essential deviation from the statements that all men are to be regarded as equal until they are found to be unequal, that government exists primarily to maintain some approach to equality of opportunity, protecting the weak from the predatory strong and insuring to all "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Our civilization, including its formal government and all its varied institutions, is an organic system for attaining these ends.

As we write we hear over the magic radio, roars of applause from a great audience for magnificent music and for a charming musician who has done much for popularizing magnificent music. An address which breaks in upon the music explains that the income of the concert is to supply the meagre necessities of life to some of the scores of thousands of the unemployed. The speaker congratulates the audience that they are not only getting the delight of hearing a splendid orchestra, but are at the same time contributing to charity. This in the richest city in the world with its hundreds of millionaires, its unbelievable luxury—and its unbelievable misery! Is this sane?

Of course, the situation is world wide. Congress is struggling with the problem of feeding starving farmers and freezing coal miners, and naked textile makers. The Senate wants to tax the whole people, and the House—so far—wants to tax only the generous. There is immense fear that these haggard, fear-driven men and women, whose world has fallen about them in ruins, who have no right anywhere to take

hold of the bounty of nature and turn it into human comfort, will somehow or other lose initiative and self-respect if supplied as a *right,* with a minimum degree of life, liberty, and possible happiness. Of course, they will not be injured if it is given as charity. Yet society is to blame and wholly responsible for the situation. The victims are innocent victims. Our property system, which is wholly artificial and has nothing to do with essential justice, decrees that a few million people out of our hundred and twenty million shall own all the opportunities to labor and that the rest shall labor or not by their permission; if the permission is withheld we must not tax those who "own" opportunities but must take up a collection among those who have permission to labor and earn. And our papers and public addresses are full of appeals to "trust the business men"—who have accomplished this industrial and social collapse, rather than the elected representatives of the people, to get us out of trouble! Not that they have any new plans. Competitive industry for private profit has produced this climax of a long series of industrial collapses, wherefore we are to go on intensifying competitive industry for private profit and by all means keep the government—which represents all of us—out of anything profitable. How terrible if we interfere with private initiative! Is this sane?

Here is the marvelous radio by which music, information, instruction may easily and cheaply be distributed to a whole people. We have a public radio commission which has the responsibility for regulating the use of this miraculous gift to man. It has been made the adjunct of the advertising campaigns of great department stores and other selling agencies. In the last election representatives of three parties were to give brief addresses in the interests of their candidates. But each must first give to a clerk of the department store a copy of his address and adhere word for word to his written address. "For," said the clerk, "we are here to sell goods, and nothing must be said that might offend possible customers." A discussion of public duty must be trimmed and adjusted to serve the sale of goods. I know of one small radio in the hands of a group of labor unions. It is not run for profit; it is open to any accredited representative of any point of view as to public matters. It has been repeatedly threatened by the Commission with loss of its license and is now under a three months' license after being denied renewal, granted it, and now allowed temporary life under threat of extinction. It is one of very few not under commercial exploitation and representing the interests of the laboring masses, whose case very seldom gets "on the air" except as objects of charity. Is this sane?

A friend comes in from church just now and tells me of a sermon. The speaker had been to a charity mission in a nearby industrial city. A dirty and disheveled manager told him they were allowing sixty-five unemployed to sleep on the floor every night, and gave many details as to the distressing situation, winding up with, "The Lord is good!" *What* a religion!—what a Lord!

Isn't it time to have a sane social order, a sane religion, and a sane political organization to readjust our industrial and commercial system? The end is clear enough: a society of liberty, equality, fraternity. It is in our means that we are insane. In our industry we must get rid of the profit motive and substitute the service motive. We must conserve for the public such possessions as are left it and reclaim the sources of wealth and power which are being abused and wasted in private hands. We must immensely increase our government control of wealth and the production of wealth. We must get rid of a medieval historical religion of death, and replace it by a religion of life and the creative struggle for the values of life. We must forget the imperial, pompous, sentimental and inefficient deity of current Christianity and reach out for the actual presence and partnership of that creative intelligence in which we live and move and have our being. To unite our lives therewith is salvation; to deny it is to be damned already. Surely no one expects light and leadership from the defunct and decaying political parties which we keep in power or from the equally dead religions kept in being by mere weight of inertia. Who dares to break away? and to be sane?

JESSE H. HOLMES.

Jottings

Until General Smedley D. Butler spoke and the United States government apologized, we had not realized that Mussolini was so sensitive a plant. Yet in Shelley's "The Sensitive Plant" we find lines that perfectly describe Il Duce:

> A northern whirlwind, wandering about
> Like a wolf that had smelt a dead child out.

When the Red Cross begins distributing relief, we hope it will not forget the White House. If there is anybody who needs relief at this hour more than harassed Herbert Hoover, we don't happen to know who he is.

What is the magic in the name "Harry"? Think of *Harry* Emerson Fosdick, *Harry* Elmer Barnes, *Harry* A. Overstreet, *Harry* F. Ward. "What's in a name?" Something, apparently, if these men may be taken as a criterion.

Calvin Coolidge says that it is unpatriotic not to

see America before seeing the rest of the world. Yes, it is unpatriotic to see Westminster Abbey before one sees Bunker Hill monument, seditious to see the Parthenon before one sees the Woolworth Building, treasonable to see the Taj Mahal before one sees the Chicago stock-yards. Great is patriotism, and Coolidge is its prophet.

British trade fell off $1,670,000,000 in 1930. In this decline the largest single item was cotton, which slumped $240,000,000. Just recall a bit of information about Britain's cotton trade with India, and you begin to understand what Gandhi's boycott against British goods really means.

Inflated Reputations: (9) Queen Marie, of Roumania, amateur moving picture actress, famous the world around because she can do well what any chorus-girl can do better—pose before the camera!

J. H. H.

Young Men and War

[This remarkable article is the Introduction to a recent book published by E. P. Dutton & Co., entitled "War Letters of Fallen Englishmen." It is printed here by the kind permission of the publishers.—EDITOR.]

A block of stone, with hanging flags, stands in the center of a London street—the very design suggestive of the silence which has fallen on the most continuously devastating conflict that the history of man has ever known. On it only a few words; but because of what it stands for, even now, twelve years after the event, thousands salute as they pass daily.

That memorial, composed of a few hundred stones, represents over a million dead. And could each stone have a voice proportionate to the whole, it would cry out for a thousand lives laid down, with the hope held, or with the hope lost, that war might be no more.

But even among those stones there would be a divergent minority: a few, just a few, would cry that war in itself is a fine thing and worth while. They, and they only who have been through it, have the right to say so, and to be heard—not with agreement, but with respect.

Here, in these war-letters, the Cenotaph finds its two voices: the voice of a majority, the voice of a minority. A large majority, though firmly convinced that what they do is right—or right in the sense that it is inevitable—show their detestation of war in its operation. Yet some of these express the keen satisfaction it gives them as an individual experience—mainly as a test of themselves, of their power, to conquer fear, to live at the full push of their energies, mental and physical. To them, individually, active warfare gives life a fuller expression; for it is a life lived daily in the power to face death.

Nobody can say that, for the individual, there is anything in that standpoint unworthy of noble minds. It led to great deeds of courage, tenderness, self-sacrifice. It produced some of the finest war-poems—the poems of Rupert Brooke and Julian Grenfell—the former a theoretical acceptance of war as a good thing; the latter a practical acceptance, after trial. At the back of both stands that conviction that, in this self-realization, they are serving the cause of their country, which they believe also to be the cause of humanity.

But alongside of this standpoint there are others equally worthy of respect—representative of other types of mind and character, of men who are not born fighters, men who have had a hard struggle to conquer their individual fears, temperaments, and disgusts, and have not come through with elation, or even with conviction. In some of these letters is the cry of a violated conscience, or at least of poignant doubt. In many—in some of the best—is the record of a diminishing hope; of men who went into the war with ideals, from which the reality (military and political combined) slowly crushed out the life.

Many of us, looking at the world today, will hold that those lost hopes came nearer to the truth, as to the practical outcome of war, than the high elated expectation with which so many went into it.

But though the mind of the age is divided as to what war can or cannot do, few who read these letters will differ as to the high qualities of human nature, amazing in their beauty of staunchness, endurance, and tenderness, which the war tested and proved.

One of these letter-writers describes war as a thing of contradictions, full of beastliness, brutality, and many other things, a misery to mind and body, yet of fineness as well. But that fineness is not of war, but of the human nature whose strong quality it tries out and reveals. To attribute any nobility to war itself is as much a confusion of thought as to attribute nobility to cancer or leprosy, because of the skill, devotion, and self-sacrifice of those who give up their lives to its cure, or because of the patient endurance of the sufferers. And this confusion of thought will be found in some of the writers of these letters. One—preeminently of the fighting class—writes that he "adores war"; yet in the same letter he speaks of the hopeless misery inflicted by war on non-combatants; he writes that you never love your fellowman so well as when you are out to kill him; yet tells later, when prisoners are taken, how "one felt hatred for them as one thought of our dead." But the story does not end there: human nature nobly contradicts itself, and reaches truth. He meets face to face a man as noble as himself, one of the enemy; tries to hate him and fails. The man salutes him. "It made me feel terribly ashamed."

What such men find "adorable" in war is the tremendous test to which it puts all their powers, moral and physical; and so long as they can believe that the instrument by which they are tested can produce good results, commensurate to the accompanying horrors, war does not violate their conscience. That is a matter for the individual alone: it does not make war "fine."

These letters contain darker records of what war and obedience to authority require, not merely of a

man's hand, but of his soul. Some of the most horrible things are told almost without comment; their reticence is eloquent. In one letter we read how a Winchester boy—almost a boy still—officer in a famous Highland regiment, goes out with a small bombing party to clear an enemy's trench. The bombs are gas-bombs; and as the suffocating and helpless Germans emerge from the ground, they are all bayoneted—not on impulse, but on definite instructions from above, because men cannot be spared to take prisoners to the rear.

That was one of our "military necessities" which were kept from our knowledge during the war; it was the sort of thing which was then supposed only to be done by Germans. It is well that we should be told of them now, for that truly is war. It is doubly well that the telling should be by men who died in war, accepting the dishonor it imposed on them as part of the sacrifice they must make while war remained the chosen instrument of their country's good.

But is that terrible acceptance still to be accepted by us who have not to do the horrible thing ourselves, but only ask that it shall be done for us? If such letters bring home to us the dishonor vicariously borne by men of noble character, who went into active service believing that war would call on them to do only honorable things, they will teach better wisdom to the race than those, of the more popular kind, which extol the "fineness" of war because of the appeal which, in certain of its aspects, it makes to the adventurous courage of youth. To insist upon the truth that war is a beastliness and a blunder is not to detract from the high heroism with which the beastliness and the blunder were faced. It is right that human nature should be able to feel a fearful sort of joy when—put to the hardest task—it finds it has not failed. But all that nobility of courage—of the will to face death—which war brings out, does not make war a noble thing, does not make it more tolerable as an accepted means to high ends, any more than the perfect death of Christ upon the cross made crucifixion itself anything but a wickedly invented device for the punishing of criminals.

People deceive their consciences who think that the heroism of the men who faced out the horrors of war makes war itself less horrible, less brutal, less of a blunder. But with the baseness of war firmly fixed in our minds, what worth, what unexpected qualities in average human nature we see revealed against the darker background, made more prominent by the ugliness of their surroundings. The things here seen are not all of one kind: and often, in their abnormal setting, their values become changed. Kindness to a dog, for instance, is a small thing, and we think little of it; but in the account here given of the great charge at Thiepval, does it not catch one by the throat, that incident of the dog running out from the German lines, and of the man who, with comrades falling round him, stooped down and fondled it, and ran on, to be himself perhaps in another moment one of the dead? Or take that other incident of the two Irishmen, having a private quarrel of their own, who leapt out of their trench and fought in the open, with the German enemy cheering them on. Under such circumstances the fight goes up into the Heavens, a deed of unrepentant sinners fit to make angels rejoice. Here too we read, from one who took part in it, the account at once so humorous and pathetic of the Christmas Truce, which—winked at and condoned, in its first occurrence—was adjudged too dangerous for repetition, and so in the second year was not allowed.

These touches from life on its lighter side have here a moving beauty, coming with a difference across that face of storm.

War is an emergency; and in emergency human nature can be very wonderful—but also unexpected, not uniform. Amid the pressure of the emergency many phases arise, which all have their wonderfulness, yet may be almost contraries. For into this pit of destruction go all kinds, the clean and the unclean together, there to become more alike, or more different, as the case may be. None who has not been through it can know of the affinities between things honored and despised which war reveals: and the charity toward human weakness of the fighting man, is often greater and of more understanding than the charity of the man who stays at home.

Courage itself is an enigma; it is not a simple virtue, for it does not come to all alike. Men achieve it differently. The man who is afraid of being afraid, the man who feels fear and shows it, but carries on; the man who feels fear and can hide it; the man who does not feel fear; all alike have the gift or grace of courage in them; but how differently it may act on their souls, coming to some easily as an instinct, to others as a hardly won escape from bitter temptation —sometimes only achieved at so great a strain that, in the end, they break. There is the further thought, unwelcome to some, that the man who falls to cowardice cannot always help himself: it may be a weakness lying beyond his nature to control.

Of the strengths and weaknesses of human nature, the war must have brought to many young minds a deeper experience and understanding than those outside can share or realize. Many must have had friends whose courage failed, and yet loved them, having a wiser pity for them than the contemptuous ignorant ones who sat in easy judgment at home.

A young man known to the present writer—utterly unfitted for war—of a temperament too highly strung, an artist, gifted with a wonderful voice—went into it, having no escape, war gave him no alternative. His muscles were sufficiently fit to pass the test; psychology did not count. He went out to the war in anguish of mind, just managed not to run away—got shot. A letter of his exists which cannot be printed here; it is too agonizing a confession of weakness; but he too is dead, and was not shot as a deserter. And he—or one like him—may be the "Unknown Warrior" lying in Westminster Abbey. That representative of all the dead need not be a man who was specially brave, or brave at all in the accepted sense, but just one who managed to die at his post.

The agnosticism imposed on us by that memorial is good medicine. The million of our own countrymen who died in the war were not all brave, nor were they all willing to make that sacrifice which war required of them. They were not all lovers of war, or believers in war. In the four years while it lasted, many of them learned to hate war, from having known it, as they could not have hated it before. And they —those who so tasted war, and in their souls turned from it with loathing, not believing in it any more— have as much right to be remembered, and to claim

that the Cenotaph is *their* memorial also, as those who died more happily, accepting war as a means and believing that good might somehow come of it.

The Cenotaph is a silent memorial of those it stands for. These letters are a memorial that speaks, and that speaks truth. And though they speak of willingness and courage, and devotion, poured out with a generosity and a faith that put to shame the feeble efforts we have made since then for the restoration of world-peace, they speak also of disillusion and doubt, and a growing distrust of war as an instrument for bringing to pass any good commensurate with so huge a sacrifice of body and of soul. There is a notable difference between the earlier and the later letters. As the war went on, its quality changed, and the exceeding wastefulness came more and more home to those whose lives it was wasting. But though that is the note which more and more emerges, no preference has been given, in the selection of these letters, to any one standpoint. Quality, or some special circumstance, has been the deciding factor. A few letters, very simple in expression, left to be read after death, have been given for that special reason. But every one of these letters are letters which only come to be read now because the men and the women who wrote them died while on active servicce.

I wish here to record my very special thanks to all those friends and relatives of the fallen, whose generous contribution of letters had made this selection possible. Very many had to go back unused for lack of space; and if, after their kindness, those who sent them feel disappointment that their letters were not included, I can only beg them to believe that their sending has helped to make this selection more varied, and more representative of that great generation of lives, full of the hope and promise of youth, which the wastefulness of war has carried away.

—*Laurence Housman.*

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day" here published for the first time in English*]

XLVIII

1.

When a man has to choose between what God commands, and what is commanded by those in power, and he does what is commanded by those in power, he acts as a man would, who obeys not his master, with whom he dwells, but the first comer whom he meets on the street.

2.

It must always be remembered that if a good deed cannot be done without compulsion, then this deed is not good.

3.

The teaching of Christ was always contrary to the teaching of the world. According to the teaching of the world, the rulers govern the nations and, in order to govern them, make men kill, execute and punish others; make them swear to carry out the will of their chiefs; make them fight with other nations. But according to the teaching of Christ, no man may kill another, nor use violence toward him, nor even oppose him by force; nor may a man do evil, not only to his neighbour, but even to his enemy. The teaching of the world and the teaching of Christ always were and always will be contrary to each other. And Christ knew this and foretold to his disciples that to requite them for following his teaching men would deliver them up to be afflicted and would kill them; and that the world would hate them as it hated him, inasmuch as they would not be the servants of the world, but the servants of the Father.

And all has come to pass and is coming to pass as Jesus foretold.

4.

"I deeply regret that I must order the produce of labor to be confiscated, that I must order imprisonment, exile, penal servitude, war (that is, mass murder), but I am obliged to do so, because the men who invested me with power demand this very thing of me," —so say those in power. "If I take property away from people, if I tear them from their families, if I lock them up, exile and punish them; if I kill men of alien nation, and bring them to ruin, if I shoot at women and children in a city, I do this not on my own responsibility, but because I am carrying out the will of the supreme power, to which I have promised to submit for the common welfare."

Herein lies the terrible superstition of government organization. Only the superstition of government, which in our day has no longer the slightest sense, gives this insane, utterly unjustifiable power over the millions to some hundreds of men, and deprives the millions of true freedom. A man living in Canada, in Kansas, in Bohemia, in Little Russia, in Normandy cannot be free so long as he considers himself a citizen of Great Britain, of the United States, of Austria, of Russia, of France,—and often is proud of it. And a government whose mission it is to maintain the unity of such an impossible and senseless combination as Russia, Britain, Germany or France, cannot give its citizens actual liberty, but only the semblance of it, as is done in all the artful constitutions, monarchial, republican or democratic. The main and almost the sole reason for the absence of liberty is the superstition that government is indispensable. Men may be deprived of liberty even in the absence of government. But when they belong to a government, there can be no liberty.

5.

Every government is upheld by armed men, ready to carry out its will by force, by a class of men educated to kill all those whom their chiefs order them to kill. These men are the police and especially the army. The army is nothing but a collection of disciplined murderers. Its training is a training in murder, its victories are murder. The army always has stood and now stands at the root of power. Power always lies in the hands of those who command the army. And all rulers from the Roman Caesars to the Russian and German Emperors, have always been mainly concerned with the army. First of all, the army maintains

the potency of the government abroad, and does not permit the power to be snatched away from it by another government; for war is nothing but a dispute between several governments concerning power over their subjects. In view of this significance of armies, each government is led to the necessity of increasing them; and the increasing of armies is contagious, as Montesquieu remarked a century and a half ago. But when people think that governments maintain armies only for defense against foreign attacks, they forget that troops are necessary to governments above all for self-defense against their own crushed and enslaved subjects.

6.

The essential characteristic of every government is that it demands of its citizens participation in that crude force upon which it is founded. Thus in a government all citizens are their own oppressors. Government demands violence and the support of violence from its citizens.

7.

All the calamities inseparably bound up with government, constantly increase with the extension of its borders, and on the contrary, decrease with their restriction.

8.

It is much more natural to imagine a society of men governed by rational, profitable laws, acknowledged by all, than to imagine those societies in which men now live, submitting to laws established by no one knows whom.

XLIX

1.

"Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love greetings in the markets, and the highest seats in the synagogues, and the chief rooms at feasts; which devour widows' houses, and for a show make long prayers." (Luke XX, 46-47.)

Where false faith is, there these scribes will always be, and they will always act as did those of whom the Gospel speaks.

2.

As soon as men appear who say of themselves that they are the church, and that therefore they alone are infallible, there at once appear other men who begin to say the same thing of themselves. But when there are two sets of men, each of which says that the other is in error, in all probability both are wrong.

3.

Our life has become bad, even worse than that of the heathen, because instead of the true faith we have only a false faith, a delusion of faith.

4.

Any slavery is easier to bear than religious slavery. The man who cringes before the despotism of the church, will be a slave of all the masters who wish to possess him.

5.

It would seem that it should be clear even to a little child, that the outward sign of infallibility which the churches ascribe to themselves, does not exist, and that their assertions concerning themselves, such as: "I am the church, the holy spirit speaks through me," are the height of pride, of madness and of godlessness. But the strange thing is that this evident deception holds sway until now. If we only compare the different religions that exclude and hate one another; and especially if we follow the terrible history of churches and church councils, from which it is clearly to be seen how these so-called decrees of the holy spirit were established by accident, by worldly power, by threats and deceptions, and how these so-called decrees of the holy spirit often contradicted each other;—it seems too amazing that this evident deception still holds sway, and that there are men, and many of them,—clever, learned men,—who acknowledge it as the truth.

L

1.

It is better to know less than is possible than to know more than is needful. From much knowledge men become self-satisfied, self-assured, and therefore, sillier than they would have been if they knew nothing.

2.

Do not fear ignorance, but fear excess of knowledge, especially if this be knowledge for the sake of gain or of boasting.

3

It is far better to know nothing and—which is very rare—to know that you know nothing, than to know something or other and to think that you know everything. He is far wiser who knows nothing, than he who thinks that he knows what he does not know.

4.

In order to be good, a man must first of all take thought for the soul. And in order that it should be well with his soul, he must seek truth and holiness. And this comes about when a man knows little, but knows what everyone needs to know for the good life.

5.

There are no two things more discordant than knowledge and gain, science and money. If money is necessary in order to become more learned, if scholarship is bought for money, then both buyer and seller are in error. Christ drove the sellers out of the temple; and likewise there should be neither buyers nor sellers in science.

6.

The mind's capacity to absorb knowledge is not unlimited. And therefore it cannot be thought that the more one knows the better. The knowledge of a great number of trifles is an insuperable obstacle in the way of knowing that which is truly needful.

7.

It is the most usual thing in our day to see men who consider themselves learned, educated and enlightened, who know countless numbers of useless things, still wallowing in the deepest ignorance, not only ignorant of the meaning of their life, but taking pride in this ignorance. And, on the contrary, it is no less usual a thing, among half-literate and illiterate people, who know nothing of chemical tables, or parallaxes, or the properties of radium, to meet truly enlightened men, who know the meaning of their life and take no pride in this.

(*To be continued*)

Some Facts and Figures About India

Sir John Simon's recent visit, the negotiations between the British Government and the imprisoned Nationalist leaders, and the Round Table "conference" in London, demand a recapitulation of some of the facts involved in the Indian independence movement. Also, since some Englishmen have tried to prove that Gandhi's position has vacillated, it will be well to restate Gandhi's original demands.

The most persistent cry of English advocates is that India is not a homogeneous whole, that the Hindus and Moslems will at any moment rush at each other's throats, that already the frontier tribes and Afghans are planning to invade India.

In the dim past, when Mr. Ramsay MacDonald was a Socialist and not a Labor Premier, he wrote in his book, "The Government of India"—

> India from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, from the Bay of Bengal to Bombay, is naturally the area of a single government. One has only to look at the map to see how geography has foreordained an Indian empire. Its vastness does not obscure its one-ness; its variety does not hide from view its unity. The Himalayas and their continuing barriers frame off the great peninsula from the rest of Asia. Its long rivers, connecting its extremities and its interior with the sea, knit it together for communication and transport purposes; its varied productions, interchangeable with one another make it a convenient industrial unit, maintaining contact with the world through the great ports to the East and West.

The geography of India has not changed very much since the above words were written and in spite of his present position Mr. MacDonald is to be believed.

As for the frontier tribes, no people have been so aggressively and persistently molested as these frontiersmen have been by the British. Their raids have always been inadequate retaliation against ruthless aggression. In the recent attacks one exultant report said that "seventeen tons of bombs were dropped in one day" on the Afridi villages. As for an Afghan invasion, the Indians have unmistakably shown preference for Afghans to English. But let us proceed to facts.

India's main charges against England are tyranny and exploitation. None can deny the charge of exploitation. The first thing that strikes the visitor to India is the horrible poverty of its people. By its side the scattered evidence of present-day pomp or past glory is like a cruel nightmare.

Mr. Rushbrook Williams, Director of Public Information in 1922-23, stated:

> A considerable portion of the masses of the Indian population is still beset with poverty of a kind which has no parallel in the more exigent because less tropical climate of Europe.

This was confirmed by his successor in office Mr. Coatman who wrote in 1927-28:

> There is a vast amount of what can only be termed dangerous poverty in the Indian villages—a poverty that is of such a kind that those subject to it live on the very margin of subsistence.

According to Finch & Baker (Geography of the World's Agriculture P. 45): "The per capita food supply in India is .83 million calories instead of 1.27 million calories as required by the human body." According to an Indian authority "the average amount of total grain available for food from 1900 to 1922 was 48.7 million tons as compared with 81 million tons required for a population of 319 millions."

No wonder that "the average length of life in India," according to the Government of India Census of 1921, "is 24.5 years." No wonder that, according to the same census, "out of every 1,000 children born in the slums of Bombay, 800 died before they were a year old."

Now what has the British Government done to alleviate these conditions? Sir John Simon's report merely states, "In our view the most formidable of the evils from which India is suffering have their roots in social and economic customs of long standing which can only be remedied by the action of the Indian people themselves."

Are these conditions merely the result of such conditions. Gross fecundity, for example? Actually India's population has increased in fifty years by only 20 per cent. England's population in 1871 was 22,712,266 and in 1921 it was 37,886,699, showing an increase of 66 per cent. India's population in the areas that came under the census survey in 1872 was 206,162,360 and in the same areas it had increased in 1921 only to 275,537,422, showing an increase of 33 per cent. Nor does India suffer from overcrowding to the same extent as England, for while, according to the 1921 survey, there are 649 people to a square mile in England, there are only 177 to a square mile in India.

If we carry this ingenious modern method of argument further it can be shown that the income per head in India for 1913-14 was $15, while in England it was $250 and in this country $360. In 1921-22 the income per person in India worked out to $25 while in America it had increased to $770. There was obviously a corresponding rise in prices the world over. Of course, all this is on paper. There are millions in India who would look down contemptuously upon Mr. Morgan if they had an individual yearly income of $15.

What, then, is the answer to this terrible problem of poverty? It is the one word, *drain*. This consists of commercial and industrial monopolies, salaries, pensions, and allowances, interest on loans and on India's gold reserve in England. India's public debt in 1923 was over 881 million rupees, and last year it was over 1074 million rupees. Some appreciable check and calculation has been put on this drain only in recent years, but the wholesale robbery during the early days of the East India Company have been beyond computation. According to Wadia and Joshi ("The Wealth of India," P. 111): "About Rs. 600,000,000 every year go out of the country in the shape of mainly raw material and food produce, from which there is no equivalent return in the shape of money or commodities." *Every year!* And Sir John Simon speaks of social and economic customs of long standing. Yes, one hundred and sixty years is "long"!

The one reasonable charge that can be brought against the Indians is that they have not made use of modern scientific and industrial methods. But the world forgets that the Indian ideal is not excessive wealth or over-production but a moderate standard of living. And this moderate standard was once a reality, and is yet possible, if India's agricultural four-fifths got more protection, if India's raw products were not exported, if India was not bound to import manufactured articles from Lancashire. According to Lord Ronaldshay, former Governor of Bengal, "In the year 1913-14 they (the Indians) took from the looms of

Great Britain over 1,750,000 miles of grey, white and colored cloth."

Let no one be mistaken! Indians, like everybody else, see the inevitablity of the machine age. Gandhi himself states what are unassailable moral truths, but does not expect them to be followed forever. The hand-weaving crusade in India today, while being an expediency, is also a source of prosperity to the poor. Further, ushering in the machine before mankind has become Christian is a tremendous danger, as we have reason to believe from what we see in Christian countries that are under the machine regime. Now that Gandhi has evoked the best and most unselfish motives in his people, a gradual socialistic introduction of modern methods will be the next step in India.

There are more direct methods of profiteering that the British have adopted in India. Take one instance, the manufacture and sale of opium! The League of Nations had demanded that "the manufacture of opium be limited to a definite quota of the world's scientific and medical requirements." In spite of this request the Opium Monopoly still remains one of the biggest sources of Excise Revenue in India. The Opium Department of India, reporting on April 30, 1929, for the year ending September, 1928, wrote: "The net profit of the manufacturing operations of the department for the period under review amounted to Rs. 19,879,-248 . . . as compared with Rs. 16,967,833 for the preceding eleven months ending September, 1927. Most of the profits were as in the previous year obtained from the sale of provision opium." That is, to addicts!

The "Dry" issue of this country does not apply to India for both Hindus and Mohammedans are prohibited the use of drugs and liquor by their religions and are at least in that matter loyal to their religious injunctions. The steps contemplated by the Nationalists to prevent the importation of foreign liquor and the monopoly of large-scale manufacture of local liquor are seen in Article 4, Clause 18, of the Nehru Report:

> It shall be the duty of the Commonwealth to save its citizens from the evils and temptations of alcoholic liquors and intoxicating drugs and to this end it shall as soon as possible after the establishment of the Commonwealth Government make laws for the total prohibition of the manufacture, import, possession or sale of alcoholic liquors and intoxicating drugs except for medicinal or industrial purposes.

Those who know India will understand that Indians welcome this reform.

England has been governing India for 160 years. If, after that century and a half, England has not been able to insure a meal a day to each of India's three hundred and twenty millions, if England has not been able to introduce modern sanitation, if there is slavery and sweating, then England has failed in its stewardship. In the tea plantations of Assam, owned by English companies, slavery and sweating in its most brutal forms exist. Messrs. A. A. Purcell, M. P. and J. Hallsworth, sent in 1927 by the British Trade Union Congress, referred to the tea gardens as "slave plantations" and stated that "in Assam tea the sweat, hunger and despair of 1,000,000 Indians enter year by year." According to their findings "the combined labor of husband, wife and child brings one shilling three pence a day at most. . . . We entered a group of men, women, and children working away, while five yards away was a planter's young assistant proudly hugging a whip." Naturally these "young assistants" hold power of life and death over the unhappy slaves. According to a certain confession: "Absence of white women is more than made up by drawing upon the young womanhood in the Coolie lines. It is a traditional right which no Coolie (laborer) can resist on pain of severe punishment."

The moral degradation, the slavish mentality, and the individualistic interests that have resulted from one hundred and sixty years of tyranny and oppression are the strongest reasons for emancipation. As the foregoing figures prove, the whole problem is one of pounds, shillings and pence. Remembering Napoleon's old definition, and G. K. Chesterton's recent admission, that the Britisher talks less of money because he thinks more of it, the Indian nation through Gandhi as its spokesman put forth a very twentieth century argument, when he wrote to Lord Irwin on March 30:

> Take your own salary. It is over Rs. 21,000 per month besides many other indirect additions. The British Prime Minister gets £5000 per year i. e. over Rs. 5400 per month. You are getting over Rs. 700 per day against India's average income of less than annas 2 (about five cents) per day. The Prime Minister gets Rs. 180 per day against Great Britain's average income of nearly Rs.2 per day. Thus you are getting much over 5000 times India's average income. The British Prime Minister is getting only 90 times Britain's average income.

Gandhi's reforms, as demanded on January 30 of this year, were simply these:

> Total prohibition of liquor; reduction of the value of the rupee to 32 cents, reduction of land taxes by at least half, making them subject to legislative control; abolition of the tax on salt production; reduction of military expenditure by at least half; reduction in salaries of the higher grade civil service to one-half or even less to suit reduced revenue; a protective tariff on foreign cloth; passage of a coastal shipping reservation bill; discharge of all political prisoners, except murderers or attempted murderers; withdrawal of all political prosecutions; permission to all Indian exiles to return; abolition of the Criminal Investigation Department, or its control by popular methods, and issuance of licenses to use firearms for self-defense subject to popular control.

And neither Gandhi nor the other leaders have vacillated from these demands.

Considering England's record in India, are these unreasonable or preposterous demands?

I. VIJAYA-TUNGA.

The Steadfast Ways of Peace

There will be peace—but not without good-will.
For only then can come abiding peace
When manly hearts are filled with manly love.
With love the mind of man its highest power
Attains. Wisdom is born of love. And man
Becomes through love in every thought and deed
An inspiration to his fellowman.

Only the power of love can bring us peace.
Nor ever can we find the steadfast ways
Of peace till we have come beyond the reach
Of self and realize our fellowship
With all mankind.

Oh, Man! Be not deceived!
The self in us is as a rav'ning beast.
And till we rid our mind of false desire,
However cunningly we scheme and plot,
Peace will not come.

Humanity, Oh, Man!
Demands our love; demands our wisest thought;
Demands our full surrender to the good
Of all. Who seeks to save himself is lost
E'en though he gain the wealth of all the world.
From false desire and all self-seeking, first,
Let us be saved! So—sure as comes the spring
When winter's storms are past—we shall have peace.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH

The Study Table

The Founding Fathers

"The perspectives of history are ever shifting, for human experience, being itself continually subject to change, affords no fixed point of reference for the mind." These words from the prologue leave the readers of this book* in no uncertainty with regard to the author's attitude of approach to the Puritan mind. His method is the tracing at considerable length the actual utterances of those men, mostly Puritan ministers, who, he thinks, best exemplified the mind of the particular period in which they lived and wrote, adding his own critical commentaries.

Professor Schneider shows the earlier purpose of the Puritan founders to have been the establishing of a Holy Commonwealth.

> Certainly it is little short of a miracle of human discipline and energy that these Puritans not only made themselves physically secure, but in addition began laying the foundations of government, education, thought and literature which, though provincial, yet far outshone the achievements of any other colony, and made New England the intellectual leader of the nation.

Later he continues,

> It is quite possible that, but for the idea of the Holy Commonwealth, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts would not have been established. However that may be, the case of New England is, at least, a significant proof that the doctrine that man is not a free agent, that he is merely an actor in a cosmic drama, playing a predetermined role, may be a more powerful stimulus to extreme effort, and a more moral force than any doctrine of human freedom.

Surely a large conjecture. The question, perhaps, might be fairly raised whether the distinction is not between freedom and determinism, but between kinds of determism, that is, what it is or who it is that is doing the determining.

The Wars of the Lord waged against the Holy Commonwealth by the Devil, working in the Indians, witches and others, and from within by such antinomians as Roger Williams, Anne Hutchinson, the Quakers and others threatened to disrupt the entire fabric. The most potent influence toward the disintegration of their system lay in the fact that it was "losing its popular sympathies and catholic basis."

> The external wars of the Lord were in the end less disastrous than the internal decay of the saints, which transformed them from the elect of the Kingdom of God into the elite of New England.

Then came the gradual lessening of the "sense of sin." John Wise, of Ipswich, began proclaiming what our author calls "a complete reversal of Puritan philosophy." "The state is not justified," he was saying, because it makes a contribution to the Kingdom of God; the churches of God are justified because they tend to cultivate humanity, and promote the happiness of all and the good of every man in all his rights." So gradually came about the secularization of the Holy Commonwealth.

But this significant change was not to take place without a titanic struggle. Jonathan Edwards preached with great power the doctrine of man's complete dependence upon God for salvation. The resultant "Great Awakening" shook New England. The author is a thoroughly interested student of this episode, but concludes: "As for Jonathan Edwards himself, he was a stumbling-block to his contemporaries, and a horrible example to posterity." Of Samuel Johnson it is said, "The new forces which were impinging on American society and thought he failed completely to understand. He did not know that liberty was creating a new religion." (So liberty can create religion?)

And so the new sense of liberty was creeping into the Puritan churches. Especially was this true in old Salem where lived men who sailed the seven seas, and met with alien civilizations and ethnic faiths which knew not Christianity, to say nothing of Puritanism, men of independent thought and life. To these Rev. William Bentley preached; set forth a religion of reason, of love and toleration, a religion without magic and fairy tales; "natural religion," as it was called, clear forerunner of Unitarianism. As our author says, "Puritanism had become perfectly genteel."

And so on through the period which the author speaks of as "The Decline and Fall." "These self-confident Unitarians * * * became in turn the elect and wore their halos with the customary pride and dignity." Elsewhere the author had said, "Beliefs seldom become doubts, they become ritual," an epigram for any period.

In the closing chapter Franklin and Hawthorne are selected as the ones who were the typical outcome of Puritanism. Franklin rejected revelation as a basis of morality, but said that certain actions "might well have been forbidden because they were bad for us, or commended because they were beneficial to us, in their own natures, all the circumstances considered." Hawthorne is the man *par excellence,* who best sets forth our author's own ethics and philosophy. At least he seems to quote *con amore* when he says,

> And at the last judgment, at the last day, I presume, that is in all future days when we see ourselves as we are, man's own inexorable judge will be himself, and the punishment of his sins will be the perception of them.

Well might our author comment on Hawthorne. "He did not need to believe in Puritanism, for he understood it." Again, and in closing,

> He (Hawthorne) recovered what the Puritans professed but seldom practiced, the spirit of piety, humility and tragedy in the face of the inscrutable ways of God. Whenever self-reliance fails (the throw-back is to Emerson) as it sooner or later must, and sinners see themselves as God sees them, piety becomes reincarnate. But whenever sinners become convinced that they are instruments in the hands of God, elected to carry out His holy will, they lose their piety and begin doing good to others.

So ends "The Puritan Mind," a highly profitable book.

JAMES H. FAIRLEY.

*"The Puritan Mind," by Herbert Wallace Schneider. Published by Henry Holt and Company. $3.00.

It is a well known fact that all through the War George Bernard Show corresponded with prominent Germans.

The correspondence was all examined by Scotland Yard, of course. "Finally, one day," said Shaw, "they came to me and said they couldn't find in their lists of German generals the names of two mentioned by my correspondent and they wanted to know the meaning of this. I took the letter and found that my friend had declared that German victory was sure. It would not be won by General Von Hindenburg nor General Von Ludendorff, but by Generals Bach and Beethoven. Scotland Yard did not know these two!"—*Selected.*

Correspondence

An Englishman On India

Editor of UNITY:

I doubt if 1 percent of the British public have any idea of the actual situation in India today. The country does not realize that the Indian people are in active revolt against our rule, and that as a result of the Civil Disobedience campaign inaugurated by Gandhi in March last, there are at present somewhere between 40,000 and 60,000 Indians in gaol, including a large number of women.

The significance of the last-named fact should not be overlooked. Prior to the last few years Indian women have been entirely cut off from politics and, indeed, from public affairs altogether. They lived within their zenanas, and in large areas of the country only ventured upon the streets behind the veil. All that now belongs to the past. The last few years, and particularly the last few months, have swept away customs, ideas, and social barriers which have held sway in India for many centuries. The veil is now almost extinct. Women have stepped out of the zenana and, to the amazement of the whole world, and not least of India herself, have entered the vortex of politics, and may today be seen in Bombay and other cities picketing drink shops and cotton warehouses, organizing demonstrations, carrying banners and singing national hymns, and joyfully going to prison in the name of Liberty.

Present events in India will constitute a lamentable chapter in British history, and future generations will look back upon these years with regret, and regard them as a blot on our record. I imagine, too, they will be unable to understand what possessed us to allow such a tragedy as India is today to occur.

Take Gandhi. Whatever we British may think of Gandhi, and however much it may please us to pooh-pooh his ideas and his present conduct, we are compelled to face the fact that he is the greatest personality in the world today. And Gandhi is in a British gaol, a prisoner of ours, whom we have not put on trial, and, indeed, dare not do so. We did that in 1922, and dare not repeat the experience. That fear is the measure of our self-condemnation as a country.

When, on the occasion of his former trial, Gandhi was brought into court, the entire court, including the judge, rose out of sheer respect for the purest soul and the greatest character they had ever known. I doubt if history records a similar event. For this prisoner, be it remembered, was a beggar, clothed in a simple garment of homespun cotton cloth.

Moreover, the industrial life of India is paralyzed. Our exports to that country have dropped by nearly 50 per cent on those of last year. Lancashire cotton goods to the value of many millions of pounds are lying unsaleable in the warehouses of Bombay. The Congress Party will not allow them to be removed. Only the other day the merchants of Bombay, in desperation, decided to run the gauntlet and recommence the sale of this cloth. Within forty-eight hours they reversed their decision. Not a piece of that cloth could be taken from the warehouses without the consent of the Congress Party. So long as Gandhi and the other National leaders remain in prison so long will that cloth remain locked up in the warehouses of Bombay, notwithstanding that every Bombay merchant may become bankrupt as a consequence, and that more and more Lancashire looms become idle.

It must not be forgotten that the majority of India's great National leaders were not at the Round Table Conference, but in fact were in prison. Not many people realize that the Round Table Conference was composed of people who at best represent minorities only. The great body of political opinion in India is organized in what is known as the Indian National Congress, and the National Congress Party has all along refused to take any part in the Conference.

The reason for this is not apparent to the great bulk of the British people. That reason is, quite frankly, complete lack of faith in this country. Had the British Government been prepared to say that the Round Table Conference should be given the task of drawing up a Dominion Status Constitution, there would be peace in India today, while Gandhi and the other Indian leaders now in prison would be at the Round Table Conference.

In going about the country I find that it is the general impression that such a promise has been made to India by this country. That, however, is a mistaken notion. No assurance on this question has been made to India beyond that contained in the declaration of 1917. According to that declaration, Dominion Status, whilst being the goal of British policy, was to be attained in gradual stages. Needless to say, such a declaration no longer satisfies Indian aspirations, for India, like the entire East, and like every country on the face of the earth today, demands the right of self-government. To draw attention to the fact of India's illiteracy and of her inability to defend herself, draws from her the cynical remark that it ill becomes us who have kept her ignorant and prevented her from gaining control of the army to chide her for these deficiencies.

Moreover, India's demand for self-government is in harmony with the policy of the Labour Party as laid down in its annual conferences. Were the Labour Government in a majority, I believe it would have given effect to those decisions without any hesitation. It is thus an unspeakable tragedy that the existing upheaval in India should have occurred while a minority Labour Government was in office.

The Labour Government, indeed, is having to bear the brunt of many decades of misrule in India, including the tragic blunder of Lord Birkenhead and the late Government in the setting up of the Simon Commission. In any case the situation is difficult, but it is made doubly so by the fact that the Government is in a minority.

It will be remembered that the Viceroy issued a very remarkable Declaration on October 20th, 1929. I believe today, as I believed then, that that Declaration was intended to convey the impression that a new policy was to be inaugurated, and that India was to be given a Dominion Status Constitution which the Round Table Conference was to work out.

But what happened? No sooner was that declaration made than Mr. Lloyd George was up in arms. With Lord Reading behind him, he demanded a debate in the House of Commons. That debate took place on November 7th, when Mr. Lloyd George relentlessly pursued Mr. Wedgwood Benn, and compelled him to admit that the Viceroy's declaration did not indicate a change of policy; in other words, that it made no advance on the Declaration of 1917.

This challenge to the Government by Mr. Lloyd George was witnessed with dismay by the House of Commons, and the news of it received with even greater dismay in India. It was an epoch-making occasion. Mr. Baldwin spoke with great moderation, and was evidently prepared to stand by the Viceroy. But Mr. Lloyd George meant war. His speech was cheered by nobody but a handful of diehard Tories. It was received in cold silence by his own followers. But that speech determined the attitude of the Labour Government. Had Mr. Benn admitted that the Viceroy's Declaration was meant to inaugurate a new policy, Mr. Lloyd George would have tabled a Vote of Censure, and within forty-eight hours the Government would have had to resign, and we should have had a General Election upon the issue of India. The Government no doubt felt that this course would be fatal. If, on the other hand, Mr. Lloyd George had acted as reasonably as Mr. Baldwin, it would have been possible for the Government to follow up the Viceroy's Declaration with such a statement as would have pacified the Congress leaders, and thus prevented the Civil Disobedience campaign and all the trouble that has occurred since. Thus more than any other man, Mr. Lloyd George is responsible for the present state of affairs in India. This statement is confirmed by the greatest leaders of opinion in India.

The events of the last nine months have demonstrated beyond all doubt that the Labour Government was right, and that Mr. Lloyd George was wrong. They have also demonstrated that India can never again be ruled by us or any other foreign power. It was expected that the present Round Table Conference, composed of princes, Moderates, and even Right Wing leaders, would have made compromises satisfactory to the more Conservative elements in this country. To the complete amazement of the latter the Indians are absolutely solid for a Dominion Status Constitution.

Confronted with these facts, the question every thinking person must be asking just now is this: Let the past

be what it may, let blame rest where it will, is it not now possible to offer to India, in clear and unequivocal terms, a Dominion Status Constitution such as will be satisfactory to all sections of Indian opinion? Were that done I am convinced that the situation in India might yet be saved. Let us make no mistake; India has won her freedom now, or if not has proved that she can do so. The only things it is now possible for us to save are friendship and trade. But if we delay much longer, have many more lathi charges and put many more thousands in prison, even friendship and trade will no longer be in our power to win. On September 17th last the *Manchester Guardian* truly said: "We cannot if we would govern India by force against her own will. . . . We must dare to give way to a demand for independence based on the very principle which we ourselves prize most highly, and which India has learnt from us."

Too often in the past we have been just a little too late with our generosity. May that not be our fault on this occasion. And above all let us remember this one thing, that it is not the saving of India that is at stake, but of ourselves.

WILFRED WELLOCK

London, England

Mr. Chaffee Answers His Critics

Editor of UNITY:

Your correspondents, in taking exception to my article "Capitalism and Communism, Brothers Under the Skin," make what our lawyer friends call a plea of confession and avoidance. They admit the similarities in these types of philosophy which I pointed out, but maintain that the purpose of the Communists is so different from that of the capitalist as to make the violence and dictatorship of the one essentially different from that of the other. I agree that their aim is different, that the capitalist, is actuated by selfishness and the Communist by the inspiration of a classless society, but I am nevertheless fearful of the final outcome of this ethic of expediency which makes a thing right if I do it and wrong if done by you. That ethic can and has justified every tyranny. I have not been in Russia but I have seen this ethic used in America by the Communist against his enemy, and then when heresy developed in the ranks of the party I have seen the same weapon turned against the former comrade. It was not a lovely sight and the hatred displayed did not seem to be the stuff out of which a better social order can be built.

Nevertheless, for the sake of the record, I want to make it clear that I too am working to bring in a society in which there shall be but one way of making a living and that by labor of hand or brain. I too hope to live to see the time when the tools of production belong to the people and the co-operative commonwealth is an actuality. Both your correspondents and myself want to see the spirit of Christ rule in men's hearts. I know that it does not yet do so in my own land, but I cannot share all their optimism about its presence in Russia.

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE

New York, N. Y.

Mooney and Billings

Editor of UNITY:

The Mooney-Billings cases are not settled. They stand as a fearful indictment of that spirit of fair play and even-handed justice which should be the proudest asset of any people.

This committee has been organized in the conviction that the adherents of organized religion in the United States have no right to keep silence. The denial of justice to one man is a denial directed at every man.

The facts are clear. Mooney and Billings have been in prison for fourteen years, convicted on the charge of participating in the bombing outrage in San Francisco, July 22, 1916. During these fourteen years the three principal witnesses, MacDonald, Oxman, and Estelle Smith, have been completely discredited. The trial judge who presided at the Mooney trial says the men were wrongfully convicted and should be pardoned. The chief prosecutor at the Billings trial concurs. The present district attorney says the men should be released. All ten living Mooney jurors ask for the pardon of the men. The detective captain who helped convict them says they did not have a fair trial. The Attorney General twice asked for a new trial.

The Supreme Court of the State of California in a decision rendered December 1 last, refused to recommend a pardon for Billings. One justice, dissenting, characterized the decision as "indefensible because it appeals to passion and prejudice," and says "suspicions, conjectures, unwarranted inferences, irreconcilable inconsistencies and admitted perjuries are treated as facts." A careful reading of the decisions confirms the accuracy of Justice Langdon's statement.

Religious groups—Christian and Jewish—believe in mercy and justice.

It is too late for either mercy or justice to Mooney and Billings. You cannot take fourteen of the best years of a man's life and still do justice. It is not too late to retrieve some shattered remnant of self-respect of the American people.

We therefore invite the people of the churches and synagogues to join in an appeal to the Governor of California, Hon. James Rolph, Sacramento, California, urging him to pardon Mooney and Billings. The Governor is a man of generous instincts. He is sensitive to the interests of the underprivileged. His hands will be enormously strengthened if he knows that he has the backing of many millions throughout the country.

We hope that your readers will send personal letters to the Governor, and that in addition you will persuade other individuals and groups to do likewise.

FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL, Chairman
HUBERT C. HERRING, Secretary
The National Church Committee on Mooney and Billings, 112 East 19th Street, New York.

Starvation in Porto Rico

Editor of UNITY:

I am appealing to you on behalf of your fellow American citizens here on the Island of Porto Rico. A survey made at the request of President Hoover revealed the startling fact that 200,000 of our children are seriously undernourished—many slowly starving.

The State Chairman of the New York Porto Rico Child Feeding Committee has suggested that I write you regarding the situation and ask your aid.

Were you to ask me, "Must help be given Porto Rico continuously?" I would answer most emphatically, "No". The Porto Ricans are not beggars. They are the product of the old Spanish stock, very self reliant and hard workers. They have been the victims of three great adversaries—hunger, disease and lack of education. All they ask is a chance. We are working out a plan of economic rehabilitation and simply ask you to aid in combatting disease and the harassing hunger among the children.

I do not hesitate to ask your aid because the work already accomplished proves conclusively that the children can be saved. Our child feeding has already *reduced child mortality on the Island 30%*. You can see that we are winning the battle against hunger and death.

Our immediate problem, and a grim one, is this: In addition to the infant feeding, 40,000 children are being given supplemental meals in the public schools. Our last year's funds are exhausted. We must not think of stopping the work as it would literally mean death to thousands, and condemn many, many thousands to a life of misery and crippled bodies.

I know that this is not the most opportune time to ask for money in the United States, but were we to wait until business is better, these children—thousands of them—would perish. You see the need is so great it cannot wait. Therefore, even if you cannot contribute as much as you would like to, will you not do something?

Checks should be made payable to the Porto Rico Child Feeding Committee and mailed to the Office of the Treasurer, Lincoln Building, 60 East 42nd Street, New York City.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Government House, San Juan, Porto Rico

"Woeful Lack of Leaders"

Editor of UNITY:

I thought your editorial *Woeful Lack of Leaders*, Jan. 12, especially fine, and hope to use it or most of it in February *Glass Hive*. I had a paragraph in January issue about your work, and value association with you.

WILL LEVINGTON COMFORT

Pasadena, Cal.

(*Continued from Page* 354)

that any person convicted of intoxication, shall thereby forfeit his policy, subject to return of the cash value. The high rate of automobile accidents and the deplorable frequency of deaths from poisoned liquor must greatly affect the Life Insurance Companies.

I appeal to the Loyal Legion and to all ex-soldiers to uphold the law enforcement officers of the Government. As you patriotically responded in war, so I trust will you respond in peace, so that our liberties, founded as they are on law, may remain intact.

I call upon the Press to lay aside for a time the controversial future of the Volstead Act and to help me to suppress what is in effect a revolt of the lawless and corrupt elements in the community. We dare not say that this Government is helpless and must yield to this depraved group. When we have restored order, we can then calmly and soberly discuss whether the law should be changed. To do so at the point of the pistol, so to speak, is unthinkable.

All college and school teachers and all churchmen are urged to join this crusade. The character of the men engaged in this vile traffic is repulsive to every teaching of school or church.

I earnestly urge the large Labor bodies of the A. F. of L., the Railroad Brotherhoods, the Amalgamated Clothiers and in fact all laboring men, to uphold the law. Legal protection is the very corner-stone of labor liberties and disrespect for law is the greatest menace to working men's interests.

I rely unquestionably upon the earnest cooperation of all women's organizations. They can have no interest in or sympathy with the vile and corrupt groups engaged in this traffic.

Finally, I call on all good citizens to carefully consider their duty. Must over 100 million Americans confess that they are incapable of controlling a mere handful of vicious, desperate violators of law? It is unthinkable.

—*Anonymous*

The Five-Year Plan

Everywhere I go, North or South, if men think at all I find them inquiring about that Five Year Plan. It certainly interests Socialists, as the letters to the *New Leader* prove. May I state my position on it.

1. The success of the Five Year Plan must be determined by the evidence, not by our preconceived notions of what can or should be. Neither the wishes of some of us for the success of the plan nor the convictions of others that it cannot work satisfactorily because by Marxian theory Russia is not ready for Socialism—even this stage of transition to Socialism—must weigh against facts. The evidence, I admit, is conflicting. It seems to me to point to a high degree of success in industrialization, achieved at great cost to the peasants and even to the industrial workers who are, however, free from the curse of unemployment.

2. The success of the Five Year Plan will not be the final vindication of Communism nor its failure the condemnation of Socialism and the end of hope for production for use, not profit. Its success will leave ahead the harder question of the effective use of the plant acquired by much privation with the aid of foreign technical experts. Such use in order to raise the standard of living requires a plan for many times five years. And even then there remains the problem of liberty in Russia for Communism to face, to say nothing of problems not on all fours with Russia in other nations which Communism cannot solve by trying to pour us all in the Russian mould.

If the plan fails it may be because the peasants were crowded too fast, or Russia as a whole unready, or dictatorship not as efficient, even for its own ends, as it boasted, or the element of terrorism too great. These things do not change the necessity for planned production and distribution such as Socialists must seek.

Nevertheless the success of the Five Year Plan, or even its partial and seeming success thus far is, I find, a powerful argument for the validity of planned production and the possibility of tremendous economic effort inspired by other than the capitalist motive of profit. How could it be otherwise? If Russia is succeeding even fairly well two of the things Socialists want will be under way before the eyes of the world: (1) we shall have an example of planned production and (2) it will be for use not profit. Liberty, democracy, peace are still to be vindicated by us as they are not by Communism in Russia.

Surely it is a mistake for us to tie ourselves up to the proposition that the Five Year Plan cannot and must not work because we don't like Communism or because according to our interpretation of Marxism the predestined hour had not struck in Russia. Where, by the way, has it struck and how shall we know when it strikes?

And it is doubly dangerous to Socialism and the peace of the world if our justifiable opposition to repression in Russia makes us seem in the eyes of the workers to condone foolish threats of embargo, or any of the anti-Soviet military plots of Russian emigres, with or without foreign aid.

NORMAN THOMAS

Hooked Rugs for Relief

There are many families in Marion, North Carolina, who since the strike have not been able to find work. These families are badly in need of food, clothing and some medical care. With the rough winter weather here and the school season the need is very great.

In order to help buy the things most needed some of the strikers are making hooked rugs.

We want a market for these rugs, and would be very glad to send them to any central labor union, any group of people or any one person who could dispose of one or more of them for us.

Some of the rugs are decorated with scenes from the mountains and the surrounding country and are very beautiful.

Prices range from $3 to $15 according to size. You can gladden the hearts of the Marion strikers and help feed some hungry person by ordering one or more of these rugs now. Address me, Grace Elliott, Marion, N. C., Box 634. United Textile Workers.

HERESY: Bishop Brown's Quarterly Lectures for 1930, now complete. Subjects: **I The American Race Problem; II The Pope's Crusade Against the Soviet Union; III The Science of Moscow and the Superstition of Rome; IV The Godly Bishops and the Godless Bolsheviks. 10 cents per copy and 25 cents for a full set. Free to radical organizations for sale at meetings and to unemployed workers.**

THE BRADFORD-BROWN EDUCATIONAL CO.
GALION, OHIO

Be Yourself
A Periodical for Precarious Times

The Glass Hive—An American Group Book

(*ten times the year $2 c20 ea 4th yr*)

Edited by Will Levington Comfort, Box 33 So. Pasadena, California

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876